MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
23 June 1965

INDEX

PAGE

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission

Bus Stop Markers, Proposed Design for Demonstration Areas 1

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Science Foundation Building Addition - 2

3. National Institutes of Health

Refrigeration Plant - Revised Site and Design 2

4. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Animal Hospital and Service Area 3-4

b. Department of Highways and Traffic

(1) Ninth Street Expressway - Revised Lighting Plan for Mall Tunnel 4

(2) Southeast Freeway, Interchange C 4-5

c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Bell Telephone Exchange, Sq. 641, E and South Capitol Streets, S.W. 5

(2) Georgetown University 5

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, Informal Review of Preliminary Plans 6

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Department Building on 23 June 1965, at 9:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Paul Richard, Admin. Asst.
Nancy Coyne, Leg. Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Donald Bozarth

Recorder: Leone M. Vialpando

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission

Bus Stop Markers, Proposed Design for Demonstration Areas

Mr . Leonard Rennie, Design and Production, Inc.; Mr. Bernard T. Robb, Sr., Project Director, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission; and Mr. Daniel J. Hansen, Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia Government, attended the meeting during the discussion of the model of a bus stop marker. According to Mr. Robb, the Transit Commission planned to place 200 to 400 signs (the number dependent upon finances) throughout the city for demonstration purposes.

Chairman Walton led the discussion by stating that the pictogram was good but the total design was too large and unsuitable for the Nation's Capital. The members commented that the name of the street intersection was repetitious when nearby signs give street names; the criteria for bus stop markers needed re-examination and alternate designs needed to be developed.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Project Manager, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission expressing the members' disapproval of the design submitted and their request for a restudy of the project. EXHIBIT A

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Science Foundation Building - Addition of New Wing

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, and Mr. Muller, architect, Public Buildings Service, attended the meeting during the discussion of the new wing to the National Science Foundation Building, Constitution Avenue and 19th Street, N.W.

Chairman Walton informed the representatives of Public Buildings Service that the members had approved Scheme A, the smaller extension, which would maintain the building line established by the north facade of the Federal Reserve Building. He expressed the members' recommendation that marble of identical color and quality as the original building be used.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Director, Design Division, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, expressing the members' approval of the smaller scheme and recommendation for exterior material. EXHIBIT B

3. National Institutes of Health, Refrigeration Plant - Revised Site and Design

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder and Mr. Warden of General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service; Mr. Hanson, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Sokolof (architect) and Mr. Fedder (engineer) of National Institutes of Health (NIH) attended the meeting during the discussion of the revised site plan and design of the Refrigeration Building at NIH.

At the request of Chairman Walton, Mr. Bunshaft expressed the members' approval of the new site, adjacent to other service buildings, which had been recommended by the Commission during the March meeting. He continued by stating their disapproval of the design. He commented that the design should be a simple structure of brick of the same quality and color as other buildings on the NIH site.

To expedite the program, the members recommended that any design completed prior to the September meeting of the Commission be forwarded to them for review during the summer recess.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Director, Design Division, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, expressing the members' approval of the site and disapproval of the design. EXHIBIT C

4. 3. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Animal Hospital and Service Area

Dr. Theodore Reed, Director, National Zoological Park, and Mr. Alan Jacobs, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of the Animal Hospital and Service Area plan for the Zoo. According to Dr. Reed, the scientific advisor of the Zoo felt that this secluded area, separated from display areas, was required for a hospital and for educational studies and scientific research of animals which were being conducted by the Zoo's staff.

Commenting that Mr. Webel, landscape architect, had requested him to state that both architect and landscape architects were in agreement on the plan presented, Mr. Jacobs explained the preliminary plan and requested the advice and comments of the members which were necessary to continue in the right direction for future studies and programs of the Zoo. He commented that the terrain of the Zoo has few flat areas and presents many problems. The most difficult topographical area, a secluded hill, was selected for the hospital and would also provide a retreat area for animals from the display areas and for animals scheduled to enter or leave the Zoo. One of the major problems in planning the various buildings - greenhouse, garage, warehouse, maintenance and repair shops - for this area was the Holt Mansion (c. 1810) on this hill. The retention of the mansion, listed as a landmark of historic/esthetic value, was questioned by the architect and members of the Commission.

The members questioned the site in relation to other areas of the Zoo. They expressed concern that a detailed master plan for the entire Zoo was not presented at this time. They regretted having each separate area of the Zoo presented as a complete plan when all areas should be considered as a part of the total plan. A plan for a separate area should indicate its relationship to a master plan.

Mr. Kelly thought that the area away from the Zoo, a farm, might be acquired as a site for the hospital and retreat area rather than use this wooded hill.

At the request of Chairman Walton, Mr. Sasaki summarized the members' views by stating that a master plan, which should include buildings, parking areas, parkways and walks, becomes a record for that specific period and should be continually reviewed and revised to meet later requirements and conditions. He expressed the members' reluctance to approve this specific site without a plan showing its relationship to a master plan. He stressed the necessity of preserving as many trees as possible, thus screening this site from the public road and adjacent properties.

the Commission.

The Commission withheld its approval pending review of the master plan currently under study by the District. The Commission requested that all future development for this area be withheld until a detailed master plan for the entire Zoo is submitted. EXHIBIT D

b. Department of Highways and Traffic

(1) Ninth Street Expressway - Revised Lighting Plan for Mall Tunnel

Mr. G. I. Sawyer and Mr. Jerome Morrison, lighting engineer, Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia Government, attended the meeting during the discussion of the lighting for the Ninth Street Expressway tunnel section under the Mall. With a model and sketch for tunnel lighting, Mr. Morrison explained that a continuous line of fluorescent lamps would be mounted 12 inches from the face of the wall with the light directed onto the ceiling and side walls which would be covered with a pale gray tile with a mat finish. This direction of light and color and material for the ceiling and side walls would prevent glare and present an evenly illuminated surface.

The members discussed the difficulty of lighting. They approved the revised lighting plan and stressed that the lighting fixtures be the same color as the tiles lining the tunnel.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Director, Department of Highways and Traffic, expressing the members' views and suggestions for the color of the lighting fixtures. EXHIBIT E

(2) Southeast Freeway, Interchange C - Revised Design

Mr. Sawyer, Department of Highways and Traffic, Mr. Richardson, engineer, and Mr. Larson, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of the Southeast Freeway, Interchange C. Mr. Larson stated that the architects contemplated a concrete bridge design. The great variety of span lengths (90' to 130') and the requirement of the National Capital Planning Commission that the structure be as low as possible were factors which influenced a design in steel with a single pier as developed by the engineers and presented during the May meeting. The concrete box girder design recommended by the Commission during that meeting, would increase the depth of the structure. According to Mr. Richardson, a steel structure is more flexible in design and solves more easily the problem of varying span lengths. Continuing their studies of steel versus concrete, both architect and engineer felt that the workmanship could be more controlled for a steel bridge. They had studied the possibility of a concrete design using a deeper structure on the long span crossing the railroad, street, etc., and a shallower depth over the short span. This would result in a break in the design of the soffit. Estimates made revealed that concrete would be more expensive.

According to Mr. Sawyer, the problem of weather and saline solution causing cracks in the deck and piers of the concrete box girder had prompted several areas throughout the country to abandon this type of structure. He requested that the steel structure be used in Washington until more is known about the control of water and the cracks now prevalent in concrete box girder structures.

The members reiterated their preference for the concrete box girder structure but would not recommend it if it is not feasible. They requested that information on solutions used, weather, and other experiences, from areas using concrete structures be furnished the Commission for review before approval is given to either the concrete design or the steel structure.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Director, Department of Highways and Traffic, expressing the members' views and request. EXHIBIT F

c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Bell Telephone Exchange, Sq. 641, E and South Capitol Streets, S.W.

This presentation was cancelled. The submission of the design for this building now under construction was out of sequence and further discussion of it with officials and the architect was deemed unnecessary.

(2) Georgetown University

Mr. Theodore H. Mariani, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of the revised site plan for buildings proposed for construction at Georgetown University. A complete restudy of the initial project, the intensive care facility connected with the existing hospital, had been made. The auditorium had been made a part of the large podium structure. A series of entrances was planned rather than a single entrance. A split level garage sunk into the embankment in front of the existing medical/dental school building would retain the same existing grade and be appropriately landscaped.

The members approved, in general, the revised site plan which indicated a marked improvement over previous plans. They felt that the circulation pattern was not clearly defined. They thought that a project of this importance requires a main entrance. Commenting that further study of the parking area was required, they suggested that landscape plans be developed with specific attention given to the embankment.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature expressing the members' approval, in general, of the site plan and views on other aspects of the project. EXHIBIT G

5.M. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, Informal Review of Preliminary Plans

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder and Mr. Karel Yasko, General Services Administration, Mr. Becket and Mr. Naidarof, architects, attended the meeting during the discussion of the preliminary plans for the aquarium on a site near the proposed overlook terminus of the Tenth Street Mall.

Mr. Becket explained in detail the plan which included outside pools, a large plaza area, and an auditorium which in an earlier scheme had been inside. Within the building would be a large lobby, court areas for future use as pools, and a large tank area featuring the main exhibit - a living stream containing a waterfall, trout stream, etc. Areas were provided for viewing the living stream from above or below the tank as well as at the sides. He discussed the problem of providing daylight by windows or sky lights in areas where it was needed and of controlling the quantity of light. Office and research areas were provided.

According to Mr.Yasko no parking lots were provided for tourists since the area required for them would reduce the amount of open space and green areas. Bus service would be used to reach the area with a distance of approximately 300 feet from the bus stop to the aquarium.

The members commented on the improvement of the plans. The design for a low building eliminated any idea of a typical office building. They felt that the circulation pattern should be restudied to permit easier access to the building. They suggested that a more correct siting for the building would be to orient it in relation to the water. They commented that the building should present a stronger structural statement.

Mr. Roszak suggested that an oval shape which is germane to the whole concept of marine life would express more monumentally and distinctly the idea of an aquarium.

In concluding the discussion of the design for the Aquarium, the members stated that the architect had a partee for a strong design but its structural expression needed further study. A copy of the transcript of the meeting pertaining to the discussion is EXHIBIT B.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

30 June 1965

Dear Mr. Robb:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts rejected a proposed design for 400 demonstration bus route markers to be installed in selected areas of Washington.

This Commission has long been concerned with the proliferation of signs in public space, and has consistently urged that all such signs be of simple design and modest size.

In the opinion of the members, the sign submitted was excessively large and complicated. The specific routing and scheduling information it displayed appeared to be far too detailed and was difficult to understand. The proposed composition of large removable panels, giving each individual sign a different form and silhouette, would negate any overall uniformity of design and add further confusion to the streetscape. And the single "flagpole" support made the marker appear structurally weak and visually unbalanced.

The Commission believes the entire project needs extensive restudy.

An acceptable bus route marker should be a smaller size displaying at eye level only the necessary amount of scheduling and routing information. The marker's design should be sufficiently flexible to carry the varying information required without altering the general form and appearance of the sign as a whole. Materials, colors, structural details, and means of support must be considered with great care.

The Commission will be glad to review alternative solutions at its future meetings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Bernard T. Robb, Sr.
Project Manager
Washington Metropolitan Area
Transit Commission
1815 N. Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22209

EXHIBIT A

29 June 1965

Dear Mr. Snyder:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts considered plans for the extension of the National Science Foundation Building on C Street, N.W.

In approving the plans, the members noted that the architectural character of the proposed addition was identical to that of the existing building.

Of the two schemes submitted, the smaller was found preferable as it maintains the building line along C Street established by the north fadade of the Federal Reserve Building immediately to the west.

As the proposed addition will complete a design established by the existing wings, the members urged that the stone facing be identical in color and quality to that already in use. If necessary, the facades of the older building should be cleaned to insure an exact match.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder
Director, Design Division
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

30 June 1965

Dear Mr. Snyder:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts considered a revised design for a new 18,000 ton refrigeration plant to be constructed at the National Institutes of Health.

In approving the plant's proposed location the members noted that the site selected was immediately adjacent to the Institutes' pre-established utilities area. This was in accordance with the Commission's earlier recommendations.

The design of the building itself requires further study. The members felt the refrigeration plant should be considered -- and designed -- as a simple container for mechanical equipment. A plain windowless rectangular solid, constructed of the same brick used in nearby buildings, would, for instance, be much more suitable.

Although the next meeting of the Commission is not scheduled until 14-15 September, we would be glad to circulate any new studies to the members to get their preliminary reaction to the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder
Director
Design Division
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. G. A. Purcell
D. C. Department of Buildings & Grounds

DATE: 7/13/65

FROM : Mr. Charles H. Atherton
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts

SUBJECT: National Zoological Park's Animal Hospital and Service Area

At its regular meeting on June 23rd, the Commission of Fine Arts considered a preliminary design for the National Zoological Park's Animal Hospital and Service Area.

Following the meeting the members were informed that the master planning study currently being conducted by Mr. Webel has not yet been completed.

As the results of this study will guide the future planning and development of the Zoo, the Commission feels it should withhold its approval until it is able to evaluate Mr. Webel's recommendations in detail.

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton

EXHIBIT D

29 June 1965

Dear Mr. Airis:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts approved a revised lighting design for the Ninth Street Expressway Tunnel.

The members urged that the color of the lighting fixtures match as closely as possible the color of the tiles lining the interior of the Tunnel.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
D.C. Department of Highways & Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT E

30 June 1965

Dear Mr. Airis:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts considered alternative structural systems for the elevated portions of the Southeast Freeway, Interchange C.

Of the two schemes presented, the one employing an entirely concrete structural system was preferred by the members.

This Commission has consistently urged the adoption of uniform design criteria to govern the construction of all future components of the District's highway system. The proposed concrete design, with its simple sculptural massing and use of only one material, would, in the opinion of the members, successfully harmonize with the existing elements of the freeway network.

The steel design, on the other hand, with its mixture of materials and its more complicated structural expression of columns, girders, and exposed steel brackets, differed substantially from previously approved highway designs. The members also questioned the thinness of its profile and its lack of sculptural solidity.

The members understand, however, that the steel system has certain structural and functional advantages. In the event these considerations prove the employment of the concrete system to be untenable, the members will be glad to review their recommendations at a future meeting.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
D.C. Department of Highways & Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT F

June 30, 1965

Dear Mr. Green:

At its regular meeting on June 23, the Commission of Fine Arts considered a revised design for the Georgetown University Medical Center.

In generally approving the revised design, the Commission felt that the massing of new buildings and the spatial organization of the entire project showed marked improvement over previous submissions.

During the discussion, the members commented chiefly on the Center's internal pedestrian and vehicular circulation system, which, in the Commission's view, lacked clarity. A project of this size requires a clearly defined and centrally located entrance; an architectural point of arrival which provides the visitor with easy access to the Center's individual buildings.

The members felt the Center's parking also required further study, particularly the multi-level garage sunk into the embankment along Reservoir Road. The uppermost deck seemed too small to be treated as both a major internal roadway and as a storage lot for automobiles. Landscaping should be introduced to divide this deck into a series of smaller scaled spaces and to minimize the bleak appearance of the extensive length of unrelieved concrete. The embankment itself requires careful landscaping to effectively relate the Medical Center to the park-like areas across Reservoir Road.

The Commission will be glad to consider further revisions and more specific details of the design at future meetings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. J. P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT G

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. Thank you very much.

MR. SASAKI: I'd like to ask out of curiosity now that you have come to this scheme, does that work as well as your former one or what accounted for --

MR. MARIANI: That is an unfair question.

MR. SASAKI: Tell me sometime in private.

- - -

(Aquarium)

MR. YASKO: I appreciate this opportunity this morning of having an informal around-the-table chew-the-fat deal for a basic concept which we feel is the first time we have come to grips with something that has a potential.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Great.

MR. YASKO: We would appreciate a sort of hair-down and go-to-it so we can continue developing and these two vacation months that the Commission has, but that we don't have --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Ours are just hopeful.

MR. YASKO: Thank you, Bill.

And we bring it here in this spirit. We've been working on this for months, and we think we have something worth bringing here for this kind of presentation which is far from formal.

I'll introduce Mr. Becket who will make the

presentation. The architects are Welton Becket and Associates and John Flad, sitting over here, from Wisconsin; and Mr. Becket is from California.

Mr. Becket will make the presentation.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good.

MR. YASKO: Before that, I would just like to point out, one thing we feel pleased with other than the buildings is this map here, which we had made and it's the first one we know of that has things so much in the news and under discussion in Washington now related to each other in one picture, the overlook, aquarium site, memorial, highways, and all of this. This is the area that we're related to so much and so is everything else, but it was curious we couldn't find anything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we think it was nice for you to have done it but we think it was unnecessary. We are not going to give you high marks.

MR. YASKO: The point is nobody else did it. Anyway, we did it this way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course.

MR. YASKO: Fine. We appreciate that.

MR. BECKET: Well, picking up on this point, frankly we were only interested in one thing for sure, and that is that that bridge did not come into our front door, which I think you will agree is almost an impossible thing to handle.

We liked the idea of the traffic pattern. This is a suggestion, and it all shows maybe a little better in the study model if you have the elephant trains here (indicating on model), and they turn around and com back. We can either transfer people to the circulating bus system of the whole set-up or they come directly into the acquarium.

What we have tried to do here is introduce some water in the front -- I think the model shows this better than the plan -- to create a large plaza area here for coulees and to have a wonderful water experience here just as they got out of the buses. The idea of the plan is the buses will come and loand and pull into these slots, and taxis will also unload here so the public comes through.

Now this is a ticketing area, ticketing point, at least for summer and normal weather. During the winter and slower months, we have an extra ticketing inside.

This (indicating) is the auditorium which we had in an earlier scheme inside. We are quite excited about it, the displayers are -- the fisheries. The use of this is going to be tremendous. As the schoolchildren come in, they can take them in there for a 15- or 20-minute induction period and then go on in but there couldn't be better room and circulation, both inside and out.

We have a large lobby here. You will notice these courts. They're put in there to eliminate an earlier plan

we had of wings coming out, which was almost an impossible thing to solve for expansion.

We do not have enough money for the full program, so instead of winged expansion this can be in as an alternate, in or out; and later on, on two floors, two stories we fill in these large courts.

This you will see in the plan is a tremendous square, almost a crystal palace approach of the grand exhibit, really the feature, a large tank which is some 112 feet square. This small area here (indication) has many opportunities for waiting area -- picnic grounds if necessary, a golf course adjoins us on this side (indicating), the tennis courts are here (indicating).

As a second step, this shows an exit back here which people can exit out and then again through pools or tanks or outdoor exhibits. This is not a gimmick actually. We find daily we exhaust about 225,000 gallons of water, almost 2 million gallons within here, half of which is reserve tanks so our spill-out here would be great. I think we can control this water and not keep it this muddy gray. This will be above the high elevation of the channel, so that we can get a natural flow-out into it.

The plan itself of the area is fairly well worked out with the fisheries group and the exhibitors. We have our choice here of entering at three points. Now we feel this is

a very good thing. This is probably our feature exhibit, called the moving stream. We come in here under the river as it flows, and then work our way up which shows here at this point where we have our waterfall, and then down through the trout stream, the living exhibit, the bayous, out the delta, and so on; and then the tropical exhibits in here.

We continue our flow back to the normal big community pools. There is future area in these courts for other community pools. This is a pool where all types of fish are exhibited. Probably some of you have seen those big ones in Honolulu. Small normal tanks are in these areas. Now at any time you can peel off and go down here (indicating) and sit down or stand on these steps. It's like an amphi-theater. We had a big shot of this and unfortunately left it on my desk.

You can sit around this pool and look down onto these fish. We have an island in the middle for penguins and seals and what have you. It's quite an exciting thing to watch the dolphin and the whale from above.

If, however, they like it better from below, they continue and go down to the next level. This is a complicated section. You can see we enter on this level -- I did not mention this-- but at that point is a rail, so your first view is a tremendous one. That's 200 feet wide from there to there (indicating). That gives you an idea of the scale, and

can see the huge room, and then you start in to get to it and go down to it.

While you're around here and want to rest, you can but if you want to go down and many people like to see these animals from the lower level -- there are levels so you can sit or stand and see the fish from underneath.

This is a section through the building which the first time I'm rather happy about. I think we had an expressio of an aquarium with the water, the feeling. It is a very simple structure. I think this is about the sixth. The first one that Mr. Yasko and I and Flad have been happy about. This is a working skylight for that large area. It is so designed or will be so that we can either cut out the light or let it come in. We think in this area there's not a problem of algae. There is some; at some times of the day, they may want to clos it up.

In the section through the side here, it looks something like that (indicating). Now this is the area of the living stream where you walk underneath the water, see the fish, the trout underneath, work your way up through the waterfall and down through this whole area. It is really a delightful experience, or can be. It's one of the main feature that the Fisheries Department has been working on. One of the problems has been daylight and how we get it in there, whether it is bubbles or what. We feel that this trough going clear

around the building --and either we don't let it in -- wherever we need daylight, we have a chance to do it. In this case these are small tanks, normal tanks. They like some light but not all day.

Here this is a diorama which will be projected on this at certain spots in this area. In the reserve area on the other side we'll need it for the exhaust hoods, the flume hoods. In some of the other areas, where the public are, we'll just let the light seep in there from the tanks.

I don't know what you are mainly concerned in, but the model would show it better than anything else. You have to really get this up in the air to see it. The elevation certainly doesn't read as well as this does. We have a need, one of your biggest problems I think was the windows that we need, and that are necessary on the lower floor and in the office and research space. By getting these berms up which we hope to be a darker granite, the little blocks, we can have windows or not back of that, which shows in this section (indicating).

This grade would come up and what goes on there is not quite as important in all of our other studies of the elevation -- then the upper part of the building we had thought of a pre-cast light marble chips. This would be a light color, the base would be the dark granite, and the theater or auditorium, as we see it, there should be a little

jewel floating out in the middle of that area.

Have I missed some highlights?

MR. YASKO: What we are trying to do in here is create a merged condition outside in these spaces, and more work has to be done, I believe, in trying to pull in some of the green area in the corners, not necessarily pavement but a little more access to it. But there would be diversified areas in this thing and back in there where people could go off and sit, the idea being when you buy your ticket you don't have to necessarily go right in. You can pick up your ticket and the graphics should be something that condition you They take your ticket, and you wander off in these areas and at your leisure come on in. The whole site and environment should condition you for what is inside.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Outside ticketing you use only about six months of the year?

MR. YASKO: Well, the six effective months of our big peak period. In the inside in the lobby which has some pretty good possibility -- the curve of attendance will fall off though they do expect 5 or 10 million people a year, something of that sort; but we thought this was an important one to avoid, this tremendous congestion. There will be big groups, 10,000 a day or so in here, but disperse them so we're treating everything as the aquarium, the whole site as a whole condition, so you will never forget you are in

an aquarium, the whole site, as a whole condition so you'll never forget you are in an aquarium.

The real problem we have is this buckeye road which comes roughly about to this line (indicating) and it is necessary we have this road and this road (indicating) because the traffic around the island, the golf course -- so bypassing it this way (indicating) and bypassing here (indicating), and perhaps some study so we can get an even smoother one so there wouldn't be the temptation to wander in here with truck and cut across and then a span over the highway here (indicating).

The only way to the island is here (indicating) and this is the only way to get across from here to here, so we feel by bypassing we maintain that whole environmental spirit which was what we were trying to do.

MR. BECKET: This could be a landscaper's dream, I think you'll agree. Our budget is tight on this job. We have half the building that Fisheries really wants; yet, by introducing this whole circulation outside, even if it is only six or eight months a year, we take advantage of it with just outdoor space. We are also trying to keep the green belt around it.

MR. KELLY: Is the little auditorium pretty intensive use the year round?

MR. BECKET: It can be -- or evenings. When the aquarium is closed, this can be used.

MR. KELLY: There is no ticketing shelter needed for that?

MR. YASKO: Not necessarily.

MR. BECKET: We've not worked out the details of that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Warnecke.

MR. WARNECKE: I think you are off to a very good start fromthe earlier studies we saw a month ago, particularly expressing this building. I think the further studies of expressing this as an aquarium you're off to a good start the You are keeping the overall building very low to the landscape, even with landscape moats.

MR. YASKO: We are trying to float it on two points.

MR. WARNECKE: Well, the point is it's not a big three-story thing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: How high is the central structure?

MR. YASKO: 60 or 70. It's 60 to the skylight top, 38 to the lower --

MR. BECKET: It has good scale.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I'm confused about siting buildings -- I really am. In fact, this building or any building is sited for the architect, you know, just to get it to line up with the water. In the old days, you came on a building and you sort of saw it. Now, I am not saying this is

wrong; I'm just starting this as a bull session. Wherever you approach, you approach and see nothing. All three approaches are off in some minor little alley and this buildir is very pretty and faces the water, but if nobody sees it like this --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One of the great views of this building is from across the river from National Airport and th highway. That's really one of the essential things, you see, Gordon; and you drive along that highway at the edge of the river. The great view of this building would be from across the river.

MR. BECKET: Well, it would be a pavilion approach.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm not talking down your point, Gordon.

MR. BECKET: We are fighting two existing bridges, this is true, and it is why we didn't like the site up here (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, just for conversation, since this is a bull session, and I am not saying it's right or wrong, but you have there your whole entrance motif. What would happen if you turned it this way, turn the building this way so when all these people got off here, they would sort of come up on the site? I am not proposing it, I am just sort of throwing it out.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, you don't get that river

view from across the river.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we're getting pretty guilty of having entrances as a very unimportant thing.

MR. BECKET: We tried that, Gordon. It seems as though fewer people will be down here tomake the loop around the golf course to the picnic area and back, and the only people to see it, then, would be from the golf course, while in this other area we think this exposure could be quite good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am just wondering about people getting out of their cars, getting out in some sort of minor parking area.

MR. YASKO: No, they won't, Gordon, by bringing them into this whole immersion area.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This whole approach that you park some distance and go on foot to this area, and in the middle of this area is a building. Assume good weather.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's a little bit California in this sense. You flatter our weather.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It ignores rain.

MR. BECKET: We do not provide public parking in this area.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm not talking about parking, but if a person drove up in a car, could he drive right in there?

MR. YASKO (indicating model): He could drive in here or here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How close can he get to the building' He can't get close to it at all.

MR. BECKET: This is the taxi bus stop.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Are you going to walk 300 or more feet to get to shelter?

MR. YASKO: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is really California.

MR. YASKO: No, this is the whole immersion deal and the envirnoment. Biggest concentration of people coming here come in weather like this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But how many come in the winter, maybe 8 million. It's not going to be open just in the summer.

MR. YASKO: If the minibuses are running, it will still drop you over here, but to bring people up and close to the building I think is interfering with the biggest operation, people in groups.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, that is a national museum kind of thing where you can drive up and get out of a car. I am just raising that point.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are merely raising questions related to our weather, and a realistic approach to our weather, that's all. The National Gallery you can drive up within 30 feet, get out and get into shelter.

Mr. Sasaki?

MR. SASAKI: There may be a kind of reverse approach. This may be the minibus, pedestrian, good weather holiday approach. There might be a more utilitarian approach in here so you can duck under and come in this way somehow (indicating) So this could be auto and this could be the fair weather kind of approach (indicating), so there might be a way which covers both situations.

MR. YASKO: I think you're hitting on something, Mr. Sasaki; they could be deposited here and a walk bridge or something right under that thing (indicating). It would get a wonderful water experience you are also getting on the exit side.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think we have to get into the solution but I think in this part of the civilized world, you ought to be able to drive up, get out without getting wet.

MR. WARNECKE: You've done a good job of opening up the water. On the mall you have two kinds of entrances, one from the mall side and one from Independence Avenue side.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think we ought to do any solution. We ought to talk about the principle.

MR. YASKO: Going back to the principle, the intent is there's to be no parking per se except for staff and so on, but not for tourists coming out, driving up, and going

to a parking lot somewhere. Out studies on that indicated this would be fantastic in the amount of space.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I understand, but you ought to be able in a minibus or whatever it is --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: I'd like to get back to Gordon's basic question whether the building should be oriented this way or this way (indicating). In this context it would make a lot of sense this way, but I think there are other considerations. The view, if you go to this map, there are certain critical views this way, so the basic question I can ask is would the building fit more comfortably this way or this way in relation especially to the water, so I would suspect this is probably correct.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is exactly what I think. This is correct siting.

MR. SASAKI: Let's say if we moved the building over more, there would be no question about it; it would go this way (indicating). Since it's in this vague position both in terms of entrance and in terms of the context of its total environment, I think that is why we have this rather vague one. Those are two factors, this scale and this river scale.

Now if you did it this way, then there ought to be certain ties to the river and then this bridge, I think it's

interesting in this model -- there's a kind of almost insistence on being non-axial, yet Washington is entirely axial. That fountain has no business being there. It belongs right there, really (indicating on model).

MR. BECKET: You're right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, since this bridge does not exist, it doesn't have to be determined in the design. That bridge can be anywhere. We're acting as though we were stuck with this bridge.

MR. SASAKI: You have a bank in here (indicating on model). I was trying to visualize this bank, but one side is colored green and the other gray.

MR. BECKET: We saw this as green and this (indicating) as dark gray, but this is --

MR. SASAKI: You are struggling very hard to be asymmetrical and I think you're so close --

MR. BECKET: I think this is something that has to be worked out.

MR. SASAKI: Well, I think the notion of the building itself is what I was trying to say, since this is such a symmetrical building there might be more relation to a central --

MR. BECKET: We would just like a dark base. I think you're right. We debated that off and on but we thought this green would come up and maybe from there we needed green on one

side and granite on the other.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Warnecke?

MR. WARNECKE: I am wondering whether you wouldn't want toexpand to really get a sense of water here, do it on one side and do it well in relation to the river, and maybe do a smaller thing here (indicating). Looks like you are trying to bring the water right through the building.

MR. BECKET: Well, this is a long time off. It's 480 feet across there.

MR. WARNECKE: You really want to feel this water as part of the river.

MR. BECKET: Well, it will be a different color, I hope.

MR. YASKO: As you are getting out to the water's edge, you'll be getting a transfer here; you will be gravitatin to the water's edge and you have a feeling of this being part of it. Of course it's a different color.

MR. BECKET: It's a useable thing, our spill-out of the water there. It is not just a gimmick.

MR. WARNECKE: Where does that water flow out to?

MR. BECKET: It could flow out to the other side or connect -- this is a possibility. The rear garden isn't in the budget in the first phase. We have it here, and I see no reason not to let people exit from here -- and have the water on the back side, too.

MR. WARNECKE: I'd hate to see you compromise the front with a lot of automobiles.

MR. YASKO: It would just kill it.

MR. WARNECKE: The water is a symbol of the aquarium even though it has nothing to do with the aquarium itself.

MR. YASKO: We are trying to create the condition that you're in a whole fishery element when you enter this thing.

MR. BECKET: We may be able to solve both problems by some sort of connection, if taxis and buses are spilling people out here, of getting people over here (indicating) and along this passage which is covered. It might work -- in the wintertime. I'd hate to see that done in the summer.

MR. YASKO: I am not really too worried on that rain. This is not like Los Angeles that gets 30 days of rain. They deny it. We couldn't provide covered walks for 10 million people.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, but it's a vast glaring masonry plaza you are proposing out there. You have a real problem on this. It will have to be restudied.

MR. YASKO: Well, these would be broken up into areas of trees and plantings, and there would be intimate areas. For instance, anyone coming out here on a broad expanse of pavement would feel as though he were stuck in an airport.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gordon, do you want to comment on the facade at all?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we have the start of something, but you know this is a big building. How big is it?

MR. BECKET: 350 feet wide.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is a big building, and an aquarium - I wonder if you couldn't get --instead of this charming little business -- if you really set the whole building in the water, start off with a strong statement, the whole thing floating in the water -- if you have ever seen Ankor Wat -- this is a momumental building that could be done in a monumental way and get a strong statement of this, reading up, even though you walk from that. This is preliminary Just bulling.

MR. YASKO: Yes, we are.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It could be a much more powerful, monumental and formal thing instead of all these little shapes, one side green and one gray, and really make it strong and that applies also to the elevation. I don't know the reason for all these angles on the facade, except somebody thought it looked pretty and it seems tome a powerful building like this ought to have a real structural expression, not just things that make nice shadows.

I really don't know the reason for those big slopes here, and also the slopes on these surfaces here (indicating). It's sort of an architectural whimsy. Eero Saarinen did

this on the London Embassy, and it's one of the biggest mistakes he did. Had it been a straight thing, it would have looked better. This made it look weak.

I think there's a start on the general masses, but I think the character, if I may say so, is just picking motifs without real structure behind it -- maybe that is because it's preliminary. I think myself there is an opportunity with that water to really do something powerful. I don't know. I am just talking out loud.

MR. WARNECKE: In terms of structure and expression, the thing you don't want to do is have this look like some office building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm not talking this.

MR. WARNECKE: I know you're not.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But you don't just chop things off at the end of it just for the hell of it. Look at thatother section over there, that's one room with all that hocus pocus on it. It's following a silhouette somebody arbitrarily thought would be nice from the outside. It's a touch problem.

MR. BECKET: Well, let's face it. It is sort of a structural sculpture approach to architecture, which many of us are getting into; but I think it does express the framework. These trusses that go across and this whole space frame is certainly expressed by that. It's not a gimmick.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I know, but if you look at the plan, You have structure in the middle but it sort of peters out.

MR. NAIDAROF: We have a variety of things to contain in the desire to keep this fairly simple. We have two basic structures. One is a dominant system of these columns to give scale to the inner space. Pick up these girder lines. They're the only girders we have. They read through to the front because at this point, this point and this point (indicating) we have a change in structural requirements. We're piercing through that second floor and that section over here. We break through the normal second floor, using these points to come out and pick up this front as a truss across.

Now the primary structure of this entire outside as series of eight-foot module pre-cast concrete vents that reach up form the structural floor, turn up and catch the wall; and this is built like the ribs of a boat.

Most of the building, half the space is structure turning up, on top of that a band of mechanical facilities. We have the usual problem. The weight of the water, the piping, is enormous, so we've chosen to put our mechanical surfaces on top of the structural system. Eight-foot spacing girders which come down, turn back in a series of pre-cast

vents.

The majority of the building has this section which runs around from this point (indicating) down around back, across the back, down to this point (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is that bend? I'm sorry, I don't follow that bend you have, a heavy girder down below. What is that slope for? What does thathold up?

MR. NAIDAROF: We thought it looked better.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's right.

MR. BECKET: But these (indicating) are expressing structure. These are not just gimmicks; they are expressing that whole thing held up there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: A girder going across the other way, the big span hits a girder and these things are sticking beyond the girder.

MR. NAIDAROF: They come up.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But they are not doing anything, are they?

MR. NAIDAROF: This is the structural member, comes along here, turns up. This should have been another line drawn back here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Just to run this thing through, how is thatupper roof supported?

MR. NAIDAROF: It i s supported at this point (indicating). Steel truss spans across to the corridor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No columns in between?

MR. NAIDAROF: Not in here, no.

MR. BECKET: In some sections there may be columns.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Holding up a steel truss with a column sticking up like that -- that doesn't want to go down. Must have some funny engineers.

MR. BECKET: We should have some structural details. We didn't bring those with us. You know we're at a schematic stage.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All right, what I am trying to say, Mr. Becket, is that I personally -- I am not saying "we" -- the shapes come about by some reason, not just architectural whimsy or what you call taste. That is what I am trying to get at. Good architecture comes that way.

MR. NAIDAROF: We have the need of bringing light in around much of the perimeter. We have to close off the building So the question is how can we use some of these things we need to dramatize or articulate -- some of these elements in here? We wanted to bring down a wash of light, down many of the walls, this whole living stream, and felt one way to express this was to open out this building, not just have a vertical wall with a concealed slot up there, but to turn the walls out, open that slot up.

MR. BECKET: Let's go back to Gordon's mention of

this slope. I think someone on the Committee mentioned this on the other drawing. As you unfortunately saw, we weren't ready for a presentation -- someone mentioned it didn't look like an aquarium. I think this gives it the appearance of -- as much as buildings here or in other places where they have glass on top -- this slope is more of an ocean, sea, boat, what have you, and yet it cuts off the harsh line of that being just a square block.

MR. WARNECKE: Yes. I am all for it. I'd just like to see the structure expressed clear, but I am all for it. Other than a box.

MR. BECKET: We'd have to have a blow-up detail of this to show you what we mean, but this is an actual wroking unit, not a gimmick.

MR. WARNECKE: The thing is,the fascia line,is the same thing necessary as the beam? You've made the fascia the same size and it doesn't really read yet strong enough, you know.

MR. BECKET: Well, you will see it on the model a little bit. See those ends sticking out there?

MR. WARNECKE: But the thing is the thickness of the fascia and the expression of a great member in there are of the same scale.

MR. BECKET: I think that is a legitimate criticism. We are going to have to go farther for you to see what we are

intending here. I too don't want it to look like an office building, and certainly not a solution in California or Texas. It will be different than other buildings here. I think we do have a beautiful scale to it, and in the flow of the lines of it. We have this little theater and various experienc out along this plaza which I think would be a charming thing.

I personally think a formal approach to an aquarium is wrong. It certainly needs more study, but try to formalize this or set the whole thing in just a big sea of water, I don't think is dramatic enough or as much fun. It might look better in this model, but from eye level and wandering around following the form of where the people are going, --

MR. BUNSHAFT: It might look better 15 years from now. All these little tricks get dated. You have to be very careful. This is Washington.

MR. ROSZAK: Since we're bulling around with the problem, I would like to take an extreme position with regard to the general orientation of this shape and suggest at least the experimental possibility of seeing this as a dramatic aquatic expression. When I look at this, despite its virtues and it's in many ways a beautifully articulated idea, I do not g a sense of the relationship of this structure to water or marine life. This, in many ways, there might be any number of other kinds of functions associated with the forms that are now

appearing, but looking at the undulating aspect of the geographical situation and remembering the movement of water and of marine life in general, one would like to at least experiment with the possibility of radically changing that shape; in other words, the idea,it seems to me,of an oval is germane with the whole concept of marine life and perhaps with the idea of the theater-in-the-round which you are expressing here, and it seems to me that the oval circular movement, this reversing the complementary relationships of these to another order, would express more monumentally and distinctly the idea of an aquarium and the idea of a marine life and all of the attending movements you are now getting involved in here, as well as water, circulation in general, and a highly kind of individualized way of looking at the life and movement and interest and structure as belonging to water, belonging to marine life in general, and distinguishing it from any numberof other buildings that might be designed this way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Very interesting thought.

In Mr. Yasko's address earlier to you, in the Washington scene, I hope we're not going to get stuck on this big overhang we are now committing ourselves to in the Space Museum and so forth. Is this going to be the mark of our time?

MR. YASKO: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we're committing an awful lot of millions of dollars and cubic feet of public buildings to this approach to architecture, which is a very arbitrary approach.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, this has a slope to it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, there is a difference. The slope's purpose is to indicate it is holding water.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Which it isn't.

MR. YASKO: There is a solution where you get a program that requires so many things on the first floor, so many on the second.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, I know.

MR. YASKO: Almost invariably you find all across the country the second-floor requirements are greater than the first-floor requirements, and this automatically puffs it out. Directly to answer your first question, this isn't intended to be a hallmark of the style.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Yasko regime.

MR. YASKO: No.

MR. WARNECKE: I can see where Ted would like something like the Guggenheim.

MR. ROSZAK: No, not sculptural. If this were an oval there would be no consistency with the beveled surface. I do believe the whole movement of water and of marine life, the whole entertainment value of having this kind of con-

itself in that basic geometrical form, and if it were just tha simple, concrete part of a cone, it would not be sculptural but an organic part of the whole problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It would be bringing out that central tank which would be the clue to the whole building.

MR. YASKO: It has possibilities in this area. Of course when you get to some of the places out of the living stream, they become small exhibit things, you see.

MR. WARNECKE: Your interior requirements are basicall rectilinear.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The display areas can be shaped any way you want. Absolute freedom.

MR. ROSZAK: You are already suggesting it in here (indicating on model) but it's conditioned by an insistence -- an insistent kind of geometry that has a limitation. This suggests a minor and major access which is indigenous to the oval.

MR. BUNSHAFT: When we get through, Mr. Becket, you'll think you've been in a nut house.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Stand up and show your design. Don't be shy.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You know there are entirely different approaches, I am sure. This question of an aquarium is an interesting one. What happens if you had a small lake and a seriesof individual structures, circular for aquarium things

that came right down into the water and had glass connections to all of them, so that you were not really doing a building -- this is a half-baked conversation -- I wouldn't know how to say it myself -- a series of silos that came out of water and in them was water, and you have them high and low and all sorts of --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A cluster of buildings.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Louie Kahn. In circles.

MR. NAIDAROF: The hidden half of this building is like a theater. You have not just the audience but you have the players. The important half of the building is its research function.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I know this and water storage and all this kind of stuff, but those could be in odd buildings, too.

MR. NAIDAROF: As in a theater, you have a one-sided performance. The fish are seen by the public, but behind them you have --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The back stage facilities are as big or bigger than the display.

MR. NAIDAROF: This is a good and rathertypical space where the community pool, a portion of it projects into a broad band of research and work space and a complementary band of public movement. This entire space of the building is devoted to research.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, you could do research within curved walls.

MR. NAIDAROF: Except they have an intimate relationship with the functions that fit in here and not all of them are in the program at the moment, and in fact this is all a continuity.

MR. ROSZAK: When you're talking about that aspect of it, you are not talking about an aquarium. You're talking about spaces to work and do research. We are talking about the symbol of marine life.

MR. NAIDAROF: But this is a joint building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, it's more than an aquarium.

MR. NAIDAROF: It is a research facility and public aquarium fused together and one both sees the fish and, in a sense, uses them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Becket has something to say.

MR. BECKET: Actually, an early plan prepared by Fisheries or something was a seriesof circles like that, the idea being expansion from one to the other, and so on. We worked quite a while on this plan and it did not work because of the research. We haven't gone into this but the track that hangs in the ceiling and services all of these units is a very complicated thing where we bring the big whales through here, and so on. I can't,just thinking of your statement, think of any reason particularly why we could not

make an oval here. I am a little afraid it would be a rather odd-shaped oval. There would be some problems on the use of those floors, but -- structurally, it's a problem. It's the opposite of what Gordon said. It is hard to express the structure on an oval. I rather like the crispness of these corners versus rounding them off. Of course some of us like red and some black, but if you round these off and make an oval out of it, I assume you were talking about the building --

MR. ROSZAK: Yes.

MR. BECKET: No problem about it in here, but I like the crispness.

MR. ROSZAK: Well, when you use the word "sculpture" feeling, that applies itself to all forms.

MR. BECKET: That's true.

MR. ROSZAK: And when you say this is the inherent structural connotation, are you saying the oval or cylinder does not --

MR. BECKET: A circle does certainly with a dome, but an oval does not.

MR. BUNSHAFT: A circle is very clear, you know -- a wheel.

MR. YASKO: It's the strongest one you have.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But an oval --

MR. WARNECKE: I think with the pre-cast panels it could be the sloping side of a sloping center or any other kind of building. You don't really sense this great span holding up this roof. Is it reinforced concrete? Is it pre-cast?

MR. BECKET: Pre-cast slab.

MR. WARNECKE: The structure now.

MR. BECKET: No, not the structure.

MR. BUNSHAFT: As I understand this, it is composite The roof is steel because it's a low load and the lower parts are concrete sort of. And out here I don't know what it is.

MR. BECKET: This point probably shows that unit whic we thought of in pre-cast concrete.

MR. WARNECKE: Is that just an outside member?

MR. BECKET: It would have a surface on it similar to mosaic.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What holds that sloping thing up?

MR. NAIDAROF: That section is the reason for carrying these elements out here. As it is at this point, we truss across behind that flat surface.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where's the truss in that section?

MR. NAIDAROF: Here (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: It would be a sloping truss?

MR. NAIDAROF: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Boy! You must have some captive engineers. How can you have a truss sloping there and a roof on it?

MR. NAIDAROF: The roof ties it back.

MR. WARNECKE: I think if it would read like a bridg or you feel a sense of structure inside and out and something on the end, and not something up above that, you might begin to sense the form a little more.

MR. BECKET: Well, it's the start of an idea. We hav a lot of work to do on this.

MR. SASAKI: Again I think we're all expressing our individual views. I tend to agree with Gordon on that slashed side there. I can sympathize with the intention of getting something other than just a sheer -- but I think here is where the slash will occur because structurally this is where it occurs naturally. Then this part ought to be straight in here (indicating) and I think this would really be quite a strong building with this straight and this part cut back. Thnn you begin to sense the real guts of the building.

I'd suggest, since this is an early stage, that this really be seriously studied because we have discussed the plan and all of the program and so forth, and there does not seem to be too much leeway. I think it could be really a remarkable building. The thing I think I would like to avoid, really, is the appearance of this being a shopping center,

a department store. That would be horrible in Washington. We want to avoid this at all costs.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can I translate what I think we are all mumbling? I really think in the end because of the complexity of research, it has to be a rectangular.

MR. WARNECKE: I think so, too.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But I think what we're trying to say is that you have a partee for a strong design and we are trying to hint that the strength of it should be developed through structure and not through -- I'll use the word again - architectural taste and whimsy. And it's silly -- these are early studies and we all know it -- but let's whack at it. Superficial parts. The partee is marvellous and I think that also applies to the landscaping or water use. I think it ought to be stronger. There ought to be greater strength in it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, Karel, that is about as far as we can go today.

MR. BECKET: I think that's the direction we need. We want to work this summer, at least until your next meeting. We want to know we are on the right track with the partee and I think there's been some good suggestions made here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think also we would like you to argue with us.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki?

MR. SASAKI: May I just express one view here because Gordon so strongly stated the other view. This will give you an opportunity to compare two schemes. One method certainly is to put this whole building in water or somehow treat the water strongly, but then the opposite of course is it appeals to me a lot not having water in the back, having this generally landlocked here and then haveing water here in the front (indicating), and I think there's a good scheme for that and you can see it in terms of the whole site, I think.

No matter what we do here, it is going to be quite puny.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Make it like a big harbor. I think all we are saying is stronger, but when you get into those things you find you have to fit into that water to get to the front entrance. I'm not even sure that is the site for the entrance.

MR. SASAKI: So I think they might study both veins.

MR. WARNECKE: As along as you are still in the schematic stage, I'd like to see you continue to experiment with the sculptural or sloping aspects of it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Mr. Warnecke, structural expression doesn't mean just vertical. You can have a structural thing that is really structural.

MR. BECKET: Assusing it is structural and we can sho you very frankly -- you mentioned the awful word "shopping center" -- we had this as a plain band around here. I don't think anyone in this room would like it. It's unexciting, does not have the structural aspect. That is why we worked out the sloping. This sort of dies away and gets into the shadow.

MR. BUNSHAFT: One thing we'd try in our office is to start to make thattop roof an umbrella over the whole thing. And all the other things would be free.

MR. BECKET: Well, this could be framed that way.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am talking about the whole thing and then that might lead to something. I just am tossing out a structural idea -- the main roof of the whole thing. That might, for example, be a tremendous thing held up as a basic thing and then the other stuff would come. That would le to some structural expression. I am just throwing out thoug

MR. WARNECKE: An umbrella shouldn't hold up water. It's different than holding water up. We want to avoid a series of columns penetrating through the space. We want to get this roof by its edge.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also, I think it would be nice if you decided -- your approach is composite. You know, if the roof is cheaper of steel, you do steel, and so forth. It

might lead to architectural expression if you decided, say, on concrete or all steel, might lead to strengthening instead of composite. That might help.

MR. YASKO: Well, gentlemen, we appreciate this very much.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're very happy to have sat down with you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you've come in with a very exciting project

MR. BECKET: That's what we wanted to hear you say.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Now just remember that, because the next meeting will probably be a little different.

MR. WARNECKE: Do you think it would be beneficial to have an engineer along at the next meeting?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They operate the way they operate. They may have their engineer down in the basement. It's just a matter of how each architect works.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are saying study the water further and study the whole thing. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 1:00 p.m. the meeting adjourned.)

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
23 June 1965

AM
9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

1. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission

Route Markers for Buses, Proposed design for demonstration areas.

(Mr. Leonard Rennie, President, Design & Production, Inc.; Mr. Bernard T. Robb, Sr., Project Director, WMATC)

10:00 2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. National Academy of Science Building, Addition of New Wing

(Mr. Frank Desiderio, Engineering Technician, GSA; Mr. Muller, architect)

b. National Institutes of Health, Refrigeration Plant - Revised Site Location and Design

(Mr. Snyder, Mr. Warden, GSA; Mr. Hanson, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Hoffman, NIH; Mr. Fedder, Mr. Tricarico, architects)

10:30 3. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Animal Hospital & Service Area

(Dr. Theodore Reed, Director, National Zoological Park; Mr. Alan Jacobs, architect)

10:45 b. Department of Highways and Traffic

(1) Ninth Street Expressway - Lighting for Mall Tunnel

(2) Southeast Freeway, Interchange C - Revised Design

(Representatives of Highways and Traffic)

11:00 c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Bell Telephone Exchange, Sq. 641, E St., & South Capitol St., S.W.
(Mr. J.P. Green, Asst. Superintendent of Licenses and Permits; Mr. Earl Gauger, Architect)

11:15 Georgetown University

11:30 General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Aquarium, Informal Review of Preliminary Plans

(Mr. Snyder, Mr. Yasko, GSA; Mr. Beckett, Mr. Naidarof, architects)